

**EXHIBIT C**  
**TO POMERANTZ DECLARATION**  
**PUBLIC REDACTED VERSION**

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 359

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

-----x

IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE Case No.  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION 3:21-md-02981-JD

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:  
Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC, et al.,  
Case No: 3:20-cv-05671-JD

In re Google Play Consumer  
Antitrust Litigation,  
Case No: 3:20-cv-05761-JD

In re Google Play Developer  
Litigation,  
Case No: 3:20-cv-05792-JD

State of Utah, et al.,  
v. Google LLC, et al.,  
Case No: 3:21-cv-05227-JD

-----x

\*HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - UNDER PROTECTIVE ORDER\*

REMOTE VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION BY VIRTUAL ZOOM OF  
MICHAEL MARCHAK

Thursday, January 13, 2022

Volume 2 (Pages 359-528)

Reported By: Lynne Ledanois, CSR 6811

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 382

1           A           Or a propensity or something  
2           like that. But I look at it all  
3           developers have the capability to go  
4           it alone on Android.

5           Q           But these were, as you say,  
6           some propensity to actually go through  
7           with it?

8                       MS. CHIU: Object to form.

9                       THE WITNESS: Something like  
10           that where they've invested  
11           already or had some  
12           characteristics that aligned with  
13           that.

14   BY MR. EVEN:

15           Q           Do you recall that some of  
16           these developers in fact suggested  
17           that they would go it alone and open  
18           their own distribution channel?

19           A           I recall that one of the  
20           developers on that -- that was on the  
21           left highlighted had considered that.

22           Q           And which developer is that?

23           A           I believe it was -- my  
24           recollection [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

25           Q           Do you remember that

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 383

1

[REDACTED]

2

[REDACTED]

3

[REDACTED]

4

A I don't recall the details

5

on that. I recall more details [REDACTED]

6

[REDACTED]

7

Q We'll get there.

8

By the way, do you recall

9

who this presentation was presented

10

to?

11

A I don't.

12

Q Do you understand this

13

presentation was intended to include a

14

proposal about the contents of GVP 2.0

15

that would go to the business counsel?

16

MS. CHIU: Object to form.

17

THE WITNESS: I don't. I'm

18

not sure. I haven't gotten to the

19

slides on any of the V2 stuff, so

20

I don't recall.

21

BY MR. EVEN:

22

Q Was GVP 2.0 presented to the

23

business counsel?

24

A Yes.

25

Q Was GVP 2.0 approved by the

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 384

1 business counsel?

2 A Yes.

3 Q Would you go to the page  
4 ending in 6701?

5 A Okay.

6 Q And do you see there on the  
7 left-hand side, a blue rubric saying  
8 "Pre-GVP: Considered own distribution  
9 and/or payment platforms"?

10 A I do.

11 Q And do you see that based on  
12 this slide, not only [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
13 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
14 [REDACTED] considered their own  
15 distribution and/or payment platforms?

16 MS. CHIU: Object to form.

17 THE WITNESS: That seems to  
18 be what the slide indicates.

19 BY MR. EVEN:

20 Q Do you have any reason to  
21 doubt that Mr. -- what Mr. Gambhir is  
22 presenting here?

23 A I don't.

24 Q If you go to 6705.

25 Do you see that here the